

~~Gal 10 H. v.~~  
*Gal 10 H. v.*  
Priestcraft in Perfection;

OR, A  
DETECTION  
OF THE  
FRAUD  
OF

Inserting and Continuing this Clause  
(The Church hath Power to Decree Rites  
and Ceremonys, and Authority in Con-  
troversys of Faith)

In the Twentieth Article of the Articles of  
the Church of England.

---

To forge an Article of Religion, either in Whole or in Part, and  
then thrust it upon the Church, is a most heinous Crime, far  
worse than Forging of a Deed. Archbishop Laud's Speech  
in the Star-chamber. Remains, Vol. 2. pag. 82.

Maximè habenda sunt pro suspectis, quæ quomodocunque  
dependent à Religione. Baconis Nov. Org. lib. 2. Aph. 29.

---

L O N D O N;

Printed for B. Bragg in Pater-noster-Row. 1719

DETECTION  
OF THE  
FRAUD

Illustrated and Coloured by the  
(The Author) and by the  
Illustrator



to form an outline of the object, either in black or in red, and  
then to fill the interior with a colour, or a pattern, or a  
monochrome, or a design, or a device, or a device, or a device,  
in the style of the original, or in the style of the original,  
Maxims had in a few minutes, in a few minutes, in a few minutes,  
dependent on the original, in a few minutes, in a few minutes,

LONDON:  
Printed for R. B. in Pall Mall, 1790.



# The Preface.



**T**HE Authority of the Church in Controversys of Faith, is the grand, if not the sole Topick, whereby the Papists have seduc'd many Protestants of the Church of England into their Communion; while they have been able to make few or no Converts among our Dissenters, who universally disclaim that Authority. And I must needs say, that I am so far from being surpriz'd at it, that I think it argues either great want of dexterity in the Popish Priests, or great negligence and indifferency among us in matters of Religion, That they have not more Success with those who believe the Church has Authority in Controversys of Faith: For if by the Authority of the Church in Controversys of Faith be understood (according to Bp Sparrow, the Editor of our Articles and Canons, and all other High Churchmen) a Power in the Governors of the Church to determine what shall be receiv'd and profess'd for Truth among the Members

See his Preface to his Collection of Canons, Articles, &c.

of the Church, and to bind them to Submission to their Sentence, tho they err in their Sentence; *we of the Church of England cou'd have no pretence to separate from the Church of Rome in Queen Elizabeth's time, nor to continue in that Separation to this day. For we being only a small Branch of the Roman Church before the Reformation, ought by that Principle to have been concluded by the Majority of the Governors of that Church; and consequently ought to have continu'd Papists in Profession, till the Majority of those Governors had determin'd for a Reformation. But we were so far from proceeding on any such Principle, that the Reformation was carry'd on here in England, not only in opposition to the Governors of the Roman Church in general, but even in opposition to the Governors of our own Church; for in the 1st of Q. Eliz. the Parliament alone establish'd the Queen's Supremacy and the Common-Prayer-Book, in spite of all opposition from the Bishops in the House of Lords; and the Convocation then sitting were so far from having any hand in those Church-Acts for Reformation, that they presented to the Parliament several Propositions in behalf of the Tenets of Popery, directly contrary to the Proceedings of the Parliament. And as for the Articles of our Church, they cou'd never have*

1558,

1559,

have been agreed to by the Convocation of 1562. had not the Bishops been first depriv'd by Law for their Popery, and their Sees fill'd with Protestant Bishops.

I have therefore been amaz'd how it was possible for our Reformers to have asserted, That the Church had Authority in Controversys of Faith, so contrary to the Principle on which they proceeded; or that they wou'd ever suppose an Authority in Bishops (against which they then acted) to bring back all the Absurditys of Popery, of which this is the Chief, as well as the Foundation of all that monstrous Superstructure; and which can never be demolish'd by Reason and Argument, till this suppos'd Authority be intirely taken away.

But upon examination into the Truth of this matter, I find they were honest and more rational Men than they stand represented. They thought there was no reforming without mending; and therefore they as much abhor'd the Doctrine of the Authority of the Church, as any other Absurditys of Popery, as appears by the Books written by them: And as for the Clause in our Articles that asserts it, I shall prove beyond all contradiction, that it was not of their composing, but a Forgery inserted into our Articles, which by time got strength among us, like some other things, without any  
just



*just foundation : such as the use of Organs in Churches, said to be superstitious\* by our Homilys ; Cuts † in the Common-Prayer-Book, and Pictures in Churches, forbid*

\* The Homilys introduce a Woman saying to her Neighbour : *Alas Gossip, what shall we do at Church, since all the Saints are taken away, since all the goodly Sights we were wont to have are gone, since we cannot hear the like Piping, Chaunting, and Playing upon the Organs that we cou'd before ? And in answer to the old Woman, the Homily replys : But (Dearly Beloved) we ought greatly to rejoice, and give God Thanks, that our Churches are deliver'd out of all those things which displeas'd God so sore, and filthily defil'd his Holy House, and his Place of Prayer, for the which he hath justly destroy'd many Nations. And this we ought greatly to praise God for, that such superstitious and idolatrous Manners as were utterly naught, and defac'd God's Glory, are utterly abolish'd, as they most justly deserv'd. Homilies, printed at Oxford in Folio, p. 221.*

† Dr. Nowel, Dean of St. Pauls, having gotten several fine Cuts and Pictures, representing the Storys and Passions of the Saints and Martyrs, caus'd them to be bound up in a Common-Prayer-Book, and laid it for the Queen's Use in the Place where she commonly sat ; intending it for a New-Year's-Gift to her Majesty, and thinking to have pleas'd her Fancy therewith. But it had not that Effect, but the contrary : For she consider'd how this vary'd from her late open Injunctions and Proclamations against the superstitious use of Images in Churches, and taking away all such Relicks of Popery. When she came to her Place (at St. Paul's) she open'd the Book, and perus'd it, and saw the Pictures,

forbid by *Queen Elizabeth*; placing the Communion-Table Altarwise, when the Sacrament is administred, *contrary to the express Direction of our Rubrick, which says, The Table at the Communion time shall stand where Morning*

---

*Pictures, but frown'd and blush'd, and then shut it; and calling the Verger, bad him bring her the old Book, wherein she was formerly wont to read. After Sermon, instead of taking Horse, &c. immediately she went to the Vestry, and apply'd herself to the Dean thus:*

*Q. Mr. Dean, How came it to pass that a new Service-Book was plac'd on my Cushion?*

*D. May it please your Majesty, I caus'd it to be plac'd there.*

*Q. Wherefore did you so?*

*D. To present your Majesty with a New-Year's-Gift.*

*Q. You cou'd never present me with a worse.*

*D. Why so Madam?*

*Q. You know I have an Aversion to Idolatry, to Images and Pictures of this kind.*

*D. Wherein is the Idolatry, may it please your Majesty?*

*Q. In the Cuts resembling Angels and Saints; nay grosser Absurditys, Pictures resembling the blessed Trinity.*

*D. I meant no harm: nor did I think it wou'd offend your Majesty, when I intended it for a New-Year's-Gift.*

*Q. You must needs be ignorant then. Have you forgot our Proclamation against Images, Pictures, and Romish Relicks in the Churches? Was it not read in your Deanery?*

*D. It*

ing and Evening Prayer is appointed to be said; bowing towards the East, and placing Candles (*unlighted*) on the Communion Table; *which since*

*D.* It was read. But be your Majesty assur'd, I meant no harm when I caus'd the Cuts to be bound with the Service-Book.

*Q.* You must needs be very ignorant to do this after our Prohibition of them.

*D.* It being my Ignorance, your Majesty may the better pardon me.

*Q.* I am sorry for it; yet glad to hear it was your Ignorance, rather than your Opinion.

*D.* Be your Majesty assur'd, it was my Ignorance.

*Q.* If so, Mr. *Dean*, God grant you his Spirit, and more Wisdom for the future.

*D.* Amen, I pray God.

*Q.* I pray, Mr. *Dean*, how came you by these Pictures? Who engrav'd them?

*D.* I know not who engrav'd them, I bought them.

*Q.* From whom bought you them?

*D.* From a *German*.

*Q.* It is well it was from a Stranger; had it been any of our Subjects, we shou'd have question'd the matter. Pray let no more of these Mistakes, or of this kind, be committed within the Churches of this Realm for the future.

*D.* There shall not.

*This Matter occasion'd all the Clergy in and about London, and the Churchwardens of each Parish, to search the Churches and Chappels; and caus'd them to wash out of the Walls all Paintings that seem'd Romish and Idolatrous, and in lieu thereof futable Texts taken out of the Holy Scriptures to be written. Strype's Annals of Q. Eliz. pag. 238, 239.*

*they*



they are no where enjoin'd by our Common-Prayer-Book, are therefore forbidden by the Act \* of Uniformity made after the Restoration.

And I am persuaded, that there cannot be a nobler Service to our most excellent and pure Church (at the same time that our Legislature are clearing her from maintaining the most absurd and blasphemous Doctrine of Passive-Obedience) nor greater honour done to the Memory of our glorious Reformers, than to wipe off the Scandal of this Popish Clause both from her and them, among those who take it to be a part of her Articles. I say, among those who take it to be a part of her Articles; because we are really thought to be Protestants abroad, tho some of us desire to appear like Papists at home. For in the Collections of the several Articles of Religion of the Reform'd Churches, printed abroad under the Title of the Harmony of Confessions, our 20th Article stands without the addition of the Clause for the Church's Power, as Dr. Heylin assures us in his p. 268.

---

\* Which says, That no Rites or Ceremonys shall be openly us'd in any Church or Chappel, or other publick Place of Worship, or in any College or Hall in either of the Universitys, the Colleges of Westminster, Winchester, or Eaton, or any of them, oher than what is prescrib'd and appointe d to be us'd in and by the Common-Prayer-Book, &c

History of the Presbyterians. *And I hope there needs no Apology for recommending our Church to those who pretend to be her Friends, by freeing her from this Clause, and thereby rendring her truly (what a Reverend Dean of our Church call'd her, just after the Restoration, while he was sweeping up a large Fine) The best constituted Church in the whole World.*

London, Jan. 1.

1709.

---

Priest-



**B 2**

thority,



Expos. of the 39 Art. p 8. *thority, as my Lord of Sarum truly observes.*

These being the Authoritys upon which the *Articles* of our Church stand, we have no other way of knowing what and how many these *Articles* are, but from the Records of the Proceedings of the before-mention'd Convocations, and from the *imprinted Book* refer'd to in the Act of Parliament. And if we are to be govern'd by *these*, it will be evident that the first Clause of the 20th Article, *viz. ——— (The Church hath a power to decree Rites and Ceremonys, and Authority in Controversys of Faith) ———* printed in all our modern Editions of the *Articles* since the year 1617. is a perfect Forgery, and never pass'd either the Convocation of 1562. or the Convocation of 1571. nor was it contain'd in the *imprinted Book* that was ratify'd by Parliament.

For, 1<sup>st</sup>. We have the Original Manuscript of the Articles which pass'd the Convocation of 1562. of which my Lord of *Sarum* gives the following account, *That this Manuscript is without doubt an Original; that the Hands of the Subscribers are well known; that it belong'd to Archbishop Parker (who was President of that Assembly) and that it was left by him to Corpus Christi College in Cambridge, and is sign'd with a particular Care; for at the end of it there is not only a sum of the number of Pages, but of the Lines in every Page. And tho this was the Work of the Province of Canterbury, yet the Archbishop of York, with the Bishops of Durham and Chester, subscrib'd it likewise; and it is also subscrib'd by the whole Lower House.* And,

And, 2dly. we have an original Manuscript of the Articles, that were review'd in the Convocation of 1571. left to the same College by ABp Parker (who was President likewise of that Convocation) but that is *only subscrib'd by the Archbishop, and ten Bishops of his Province*; *Ibid.* whereas those of 1562. are subscrib'd by both Houses of the Province of Canterbury, and some Bishops of the Province of York.

Now that the Clause of the *Church's Power* is not in the beginning of the twentieth Article of either of these Manuscripts, appears from several Collations that have lately been made of our modern printed Editions with them. The Reader may satisfy himself about the truth of this matter from my Lord of Sarum's *Exposition* only; where Dr. Moss, Mr. Faggard, and Mr. Lunn, Fellows of the College, testify that the Clause is not in the Manuscript of 1562. and where Dr. Green, the present Master of the College, certifies the Bishop that it is wanting in that of 1571. *lb. p. 10. P. 13.*

3dly. As to the *Imprinted Book of Articles* that was ratify'd by Parliament, either it was never tack'd to the original Record of the Act, or else it has been since purloin'd from it: for upon examination in the Office where the Records are kept, the *\* Imprinted Book* refer'd to in the Act of Parliament is not to be found. Yet Providence has pre-serv'd to us the most compleat Evidence in the world (next to the appearance of the *imprinted Book* it self tack'd to the Record) that the *Clause of the Church's Power* was not in the *imprinted Book* ratify'd by Parliament; *\* Q. Where to find the Articles by Law establish'd, since the Imprinted Book pass'd by Parliament, that contain'd them, is not upon record?*

liament; and that is, *Notoriety of Fact*, even among the Clergy themselves. For,

Laud's  
Speech in  
the Star-  
Chamber :  
in his Re-  
mains, vol.  
2. p. 82.

1. When the famous *Burton* affirm'd, in an *Epistle to the Temporal Lords*, That the *Prelates* had forg'd a new *Article of Religion* brought from *Rome* (*viz.* The Church hath a Power to decree Rites and Ceremonys, and Authority in Controversys of Faith) which gives 'em full power to alter the *Doctrine* and *Discipline* of our Church at a blow, and have foisted it into the beginning of the twentieth *Article* of our Church; for, says he, it is not to be found in the *Articles* of *Queen Elizabeth*, ratify'd by *Parliament*: *Archbishop Laud* (who in his *Speech in the Star-Chamber* endeavours to vindicate the Authority of this *Clause* against this *Passage* of *Burton*) does not deny what *Burton* alledges, That it is not to be found in the *Articles* ratify'd by *Parliament*; but only labours to prove, first, That he himself did not forge the *Clause* (from which Charge I allow he effectually clears himself) and secondly, argues for the Authority of the *Clause* from several antient printed Copys, and from the *publick Records* kept in his Office. And it cannot be doubted but his Zeal for that *Clause* wou'd have led him to affirm it was ratify'd by *Parliament*, had not the Matter of *Fact* been very *notorious*.

Cent. 16.  
P. 74.

2. *Dr. Thomas Fuller*, a Reverend Divine of the Church of *England*, in his *Church-History* of Great Britain, says, That the *Clause* of the Church's Power, is omitted in the *English* and *Latin Articles* set forth in 1571. when they were first ratify'd by *Act*: And then proceeds to make this just Observation



vation upon the Authority of the whole Body of our Articles, as they stood without this Clause; *That their being obligatory to Punishment bears not date from their \* Composition in Convocation in the Year 1562. but henceforward from their Confirmation in Parliament.*

3. Dr. Heylin, Archbishop Laud's Chaplain, in his *Animadversions* on this Passage of Fuller, confirms Fuller's Account of the matter, and only censures him, first, for making the Articles obligatory but from the time of their being confirm'd by Parliament; and secondly, for using the term *Confirmation* with relation to the Act wherein the Articles receiv'd their legal Authority. His words are: *Our Author does so dream of the Power of Parliaments in matters of Religion, that he will not suffer any † Act of Convocation to be obligatory to the Subject, till confirm'd by Par-* Heylin's Animad. on Fuller's Church-Hist. p. 146, 147.

---

\* Fuller, tho he thought the Clause not obligatory, was misled so far by Archbishop Laud's Speech in the Star-Chamber, as to imagine it was extant in the Records of the Convocation of 1562.

† The Convocation of 1562. disclaim'd all pretence to a Legislative Power in matters of Religion, so much insisted on of late by our High-Church Priests; and had very different Notions of their own and of the Parliament's Power, from this Reverend High Churchman: For at the end of the Original Manuscript of the Articles, immediately after the Subscribers Names, are added these words; *Ista Subscriptio facta est ab omnibus sub hac protestatione, quod nihil statuunt in præjudicium cujusquam Senatusconsulti; sed tantum supplicem libellum, Petitiones suas continentem, humiliter offerunt.* In English thus: This Subscription is made by all with this protestation, That they resolve on nothing in prejudice of the Privileges and Rights of either House of Parliament; but only humbly offer this supplicatory Book of Articles, containing their Requests or Petitions.

liament.

liament. But I wou'd fain know of him where he finds any Act of Parliament, that confirms these Articles. There was nothing done by the Parliament to confirm these Articles, but only a pious Care express'd for Reformation, by requiring Subscriptions of the Clergy to them under temporal Punishments. And then concludes, That Fuller might very well have spar'd this flourish, " That the Obligatoriness of these Articles, as to temporal Punishment, bears not date nine years before from their Composition in Convocation, but henceforward from their Confirmation in Parliament." And I think it can't be doubted, but Heylin had Zeal enough for the Authority of this Clause, and against his Adversary Fuller, to have affirm'd, That it was not omitted in the imprinted Book, to which the Parliament requir'd the Subscriptions of the Clergy; had not Fuller's Assertion, That it was omitted, been undoubtedly true.

4. Bishop Pearson says, In the Year 1571. the Articles were reprinted, and then the Act of Parliament was publish'd; which words do imply his Opinion, that the Book pass'd by Parliament was printed in 1571. But however, for a fuller Confirmation of the matter, take his further Explanation. He says, That the Articles of Religion to which King Charles I's Declaration is affix'd, are the same with the Articles mention'd in the 13th of Eliz. in number, nature, substance and words; as he is assur'd, having himself diligently collated them with an Edition of the Articles, printed by R. Jugg and J. Cawood Printers to the Queen's Majesty Anno Domini 1571. These last words evidently show Bishop Pearson's Opinion
- Bibl.Scrip. the Articles were reprinted, and then the Act of  
Eccl.Ang. Parliament was publish'd; which words do  
p. 362. imply his Opinion, that the Book pass'd by  
Parliament was printed in 1571. But how-  
ever, for a fuller Confirmation of the mat-  
ter, take his further Explanation. He says,  
P. 383. That the Articles of Religion to which King  
Charles I's Declaration is affix'd, are the same  
C. 12. with the Articles mention'd in the 13th of Eliz.  
in number, nature, substance and words; as he  
is assur'd, having himself diligently collated them  
with an Edition of the Articles, printed by R.  
Jugg and J. Cawood Printers to the Queen's  
Majesty Anno Domini 1571. These last  
words evidently show Bishop Pearson's Opi-  
nion

nion, *That the imprinted Book ratify'd by Parliament, was a Book printed 1571. by Jugg and Cawood.* And if that was the Book ratify'd by Parliament, nothing can be plainer than that the Clause of the *Church's Power* was not ratify'd by Parliament. I have that very Edition without the Clause; but the Reader may perhaps be satisfy'd in this matter by either \* *Fuller*, or † *Laud*, or ‖ *Heylin*, or my \*\* *Lord of Sarum*, who all affirm that *the Clause of the Church's Power was left out in the Editions of 1571.*

There is one thing in this last Citation out of *Bishop Pearson* would have amaz'd me, had not a little inquiry into Ecclesiastical History convinc'd me that nothing was more reconcilable in practice than writing *Expositions on the Creed*, and downright Forgery and Falsification. For notwithstanding *Bishop Pearson* affirms that *the Articles printed with King Charles the First's Declaration before them are the same in Number, Nature, Substance and Words, with those printed by Jugg and Cawood in 1571.* and that he himself collated them: yet there is this material difference between these two Editions; the Articles printed with *Charles the First's Declaration* have the Clause of the *Church's Power* in them, and the Articles printed by *Jugg and Cawood* in 1571. are without the Clause; and I am ready to produce both

---

\* Church-Hist. cent. 16. p. 74.

† Remains, vol. 2. p. 83.

‖ History of the Presbyt. 268.

\*\* Expos. p. 16.



these Editions for the satisfaction of any Inquirer.

5. The several printed Editions of the Articles in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth* are another evidence how *notorious* it was that the Clause of the *Church's Power* was never ratify'd by Parliament. I have, as I said before, an Edition of the Articles in *English* in the Year 1571. by *Richard Jugg* and *John Cawood* Printers to the Queen, when they were first ratify'd by Parliament, wherein the Clause of the *Church's Power* is omitted. I have likewise another Edition, printed the same year in *Latin* by *John Day*, without the Clause. And yet Bishop *Sparrow* has the assurance to pretend to give us a *Latin Copy* of the *Articles*, under the title of *Articles, &c. printed by John Day in 1571.* wherein he has inserted the Clause of the *Church's Power*, contrary to *John Day's* own Edition. But what surpriz'd me extremely, was to find a *Latin Copy* of our *Articles* under the same title, with the Clause likewise inserted, printed before my Lord *Sarum's Exposition of the thirty nine Articles*; which I did not expect to find in a Book written by one that has shew'd so much ingenuity as my Lord of *Sarum* has done in this Affair: for it is from the Discoverys made by him of old Manuscripts, that I had the first hint of the Forgery of this Clause.

However, I think I have just grounds to clear my Lord himself from any design to impose on the Reader; but may rather suppose in his behalf, That when he sent his *Exposition of the Thirty Nine Articles*

Collection  
of Artic.  
&c. printed  
1671.  
p. 207.

*ticles* to be printed, he trusted to some Chaplain or Corrector of the Press to put a *Latin* Edition of the Articles before his Book, who has thus impos'd on his Lordship and the World. And my reason for not making this an Act of his Lordship, is, because his Lordship knew, *That the Clause of the Church's Power was left out of the printed Editions of 1571.* Exp. p.16.

The Omission of this Clause in the Year 1571. was so notorious, that Archbishop *Laud* confesses it, and gives reasons why it was so. Says he, *In fact this is manifest, that in the Year 1571. the Articles were printed both in Latin and English, and this Clause for the Church left out of both. And certainly, says he, this cou'd not be done but by the malicious Cunning of that opposite Faction. And tho I shall spare dead Mens Names where I have not certainty, yet if you please to consider who they were that govern'd Businesses in 1571. and rid the Church almost at their pleasure, you will think it no hard matter to have the Articles printed, and this Clause left out.* This the Reader must needs think a most choice Remark, when he considers that the Convocation of 1571. pass'd the Articles without this Clause, as well as the Parliament; and consequently that they who *rid the Church* at that time, were the *Governours* thereof, in the Archbishop's own sense of the word. By whom wou'd he have had the *Church rid*, but by its *Governours*? And if he wou'd have it *rid* by them, why shou'd he not suppose these *Governours* had as much right to omit the Clause of the *Church's Power* if they

Speech in  
the Star-  
Chamber.  
Rem. vol.  
2. p. 83.

C 2

thought

thought fit, as any other Governours had to insert it in the Articles? But I find no Proceedings of Church-Governours will satisfy the greatest Advocates of their Power, unless they be perfectly agreeable to their Inclinations, any more than they do the errantest Fanaticks in the world. And this Observation is not only verify'd by this Remark of Archbishop *Laud*, but by the Proceedings of the High-Church Priests at this day, who at the same time that they preach up the greatest Submission in the world to the Governours of the Church, and make 'em all to be *Jure Divino*, are continually affronting and abusing 'em in the most scandalous manner: whereby they become so much worse than the Fanaticks of old, in that they are inconsistent with themselves; whereas the Fanaticks deny'd that they ow'd the Bishops any Subjection.

But to return: The Articles were not only printed without the Clause of the *Church's Power* in the Year 1571. but continu'd to be printed so for some time after. A Friend at *Oxford* writes me word, That there is a Latin Copy of the Articles in the Bodleian Library, printed 1575. in which the Clause of the Church's Power is omitted. How long it was after 1571. before the Clause was put into the printed Copys, my Lord of *Sarum* says he cannot find out. But if Archbishop *Laud* gives us a compleat List of the printed Editions of the Articles, it was not inserted in the Articles till 1593. And if Dr. *Heylin's* word is to be taken, he confirms the Omission of the Clause till that Year. He

Exp. p. 16.  
Speech,  
p. 83.



He says, *The Clause of the Church's Power* Hist. of the  
*was left out in the new Impression of 1571. and Presbyt.*  
*was accordingly left out in all the Harmonys of P. 268.*  
*Confessions, or other Collections of the same.*  
*And so it stood in England till the death*  
*of Leicester, after which in the Year 1593. it*  
*was again reprinted.* So that, according to the  
 confession even of *Laud and Heylin*, the Clause  
 was left out in the printed Copys, not only in  
 the Year wherein the Articles were ratify'd  
 by Law, but for two and twenty Years af-  
 terwards: and this, I suppose, will be al-  
 low'd by all impartial Judges to be a good  
 Evidence of the *Notoriety* of the Fact, That  
 the Clause of the *Church's Power* was not in  
 the *imprinted Book* ratify'd by Parliament.

But 6. and lastly: To put the matter  
 upon such an issue as may clearly demonstrate  
 that the *imprinted Book* ratify'd by Parliament  
 was without the Clause; I desire those who  
 defend its Authority to produce any one *Eng-*  
*lish* Edition of the Articles (for it was an *Eng-*  
*lish* one that was ratify'd by Parliament) prin-  
 ted in or before the Year 1571. when the Ar-  
 ticles were confirm'd by Law, that contains  
 the Clause of the Church's Power in it. And  
 if this cannot be done, it is a demonstration  
 that the Parliament pass'd the Articles with-  
 out the Clause, unless they cou'd pass a prin-  
 ted Book before it was printed; tho did  
 such an *English Book* appear, it wou'd be no  
 proof at all that the *imprinted Book* ratify'd  
 by Parliament had the Clause in: for I have  
 prov'd by sufficient Evidence before, that  
 they pass'd an *imprinted Book* without the  
 Clause.

Having

Having thus stated the Evidence against the Authority of the Clause, I come now to consider what has been urg'd in its behalf.

Speech, And first Archbishop Laud says, *The Ar-*  
p. 83. *ticles were printed in Latin in 1563. (the Year*  
*after they pass'd in Convocation) with the*  
*affirmative Clause of the Church's Power in*  
Exp. p. 16. *them.* And my Lord of Sarum speaks of one

Copy printed in that Year : But Dr. Heylin  
Hist. of the goes further, and says, *That the Clause of*  
Presbyt. *the Church's Power was printed as a part of the*  
p. 268. *twentieth Article, both in Latin and English,*  
*1562. [I suppose it shou'd be 1563.]*

Of the Insertion of this Clause in the  
printed Edition of 1563. contrary to the  
original Manuscript of the Articles sub-  
scrib'd by the Convocation in 1562. my Lord  
of Sarum makes the following use: Says he,  
Exp. p. 16. *The Alteration from the original Manuscript*  
*was then made when the thing was fresh and well*  
*known; therefore no Fraud nor Artifice is to be*  
*suspected, since some Objections wou'd have been*  
*then made, especially by the great Party of the*  
*complying Papists, who then continu'd in the*  
*Church: They wou'd not have fail'd to have*  
*made much use of this, and to have taken great*  
*advantages from it, if there had been any occa-*  
*sion or colour for it; and yet nothing of this kind*  
*was done.*

1. In answer to which, I beseech his Lord-  
ship to consider what greater evidence there  
can be of a *Fraud*, than the printed Articles  
of 1563. contradicting the original Manu-  
script subscrib'd by both Houses of Convo-  
cation the Year before? Especially when a  
subsequent Convocation in 1571. thought fit

to

to review the Articles, and ratify them without the Clause of the *Church's Power*. This last Act of Convocation ought to be look'd on as decisive of the *Fraud*, since they proceeded so contrary to the printed Edition of 1563.

2. As to my Lord of *Sarum's* reason why *no Fraud is to be suspected*, viz. *Because the complying Papists made no complaint*; I can see no force at all in it, because the complying Papists were so far from having any cause to complain of the addition of that *Clause*, that they must be pleas'd to see our Church make so great a step so early after the Reformation towards them, and vest such a Power in the *Church* as they always contended for. And perhaps these *complying Papists* had as great a hand in the Forgery, as I shall prove their Successors, the *complying High-Churchmen*, have had in endeavouring to perpetuate it to Posterity.

3. But my Lord imagines, *That such an Alteration cou'd not be made while the thing was fresh and well known*: Whereas I think the Experience of all Ages shows how easy Impositions of this kind are; and I dare say, my Lord of *Sarum*, out of his vast reading, is able to give us a *History* of Impositions of that kind, as big as his *History of the Reformation*.

(1.) The Stupidity of Mankind, even in the times of the greatest Liberty and Freedom of thinking, was always security enough for some Impositions. For who at this day among the Laity dare give themselves the trouble to examine into the Authority of the Articles of any Church (when meddling



meddling with such Sacred Things always exposes a Man to the imputation of Atheism) or are able to tell what the Articles of their own Church are? The Laity are ever ready to fight the Priests Battles, and contend eagerly for what they determine in their Synods and Convocations, without ever troubling themselves to understand what it is they fight and contend for. But in Queen Elizabeth's time the State of Affairs was very different from what it is at this time. There was not only less Liberty and Freedom of thinking, but a most excessive Ignorance was spread throughout the Nation. Mr. Strype says in his *Annals*, That many of the Subscribers of the Lower House of Convocation of 1562. (who were without doubt the most learned of the inferiour Clergy) wrote so ill, that it is difficult to read their Names. And in the *Injunctions* set forth in the Year 1559. All Ministers and Readers of publick Prayers, Chapters and Homilys, are charg'd to read leisurely, plainly and distinctly, and to peruse over before once or twice the Chapters and Homilys, to the intent they may read to the better understanding of the People. And as a further Specimen of the Ignorance of those times, it may not be amiss to give the Reader an entertaining Passage out of Dr. Langbain's Preface before a Book of Sir John Cheek's, intituled, *The true Subject to the Rebel*. Says he, *What rare Preachers shall we imagine they had at the University in Queen Elizabeth's time, when Mr. Taver-nour of Water-Eaton, High Sheriff of Oxfordshire, came in pure Charity, not Ostentation,*

Pag. 291.

Sparrow's  
Collect.  
p. 81.

to give the Scholars a Sermon in St. Mary's, with his Gold Chain about his neck, and Sword by his side, beginning with these words: " Arriving at the Mount of St. Mary's on the stony Stage where I now stand, I have brought you some fine Biskets, baked in the Oven of Charity, and carefully conserv'd for the Chickens of the Church, the Sparrows of the Spirit, and the sweet Swallows of Salvation."

But to bring the Ignorance or Negligence of Queen Elizabeth's time home to the present Question, I ask what greater instance can there be either of the one or the other, than such a silence among the Writers of that time concerning the Authority of this Clause? For tho it was printed in some Editions of the Articles, and left out in others, yet I cannot find the least notice taken of it by any Authors of that time; so little were the Articles of the Church regarded, and so easy was it for the Clergy to print what they pleas'd for Articles of the Church. Nothing therefore can possibly hinder Frauds of this kind, but the Honesty and Integrity of the Clergy, or their fear of being discover'd: But neither of these can be thought a sufficient Security to any one who has look'd into the History of other Countries, or even of his own, where the Clergy in the Reign of Richard the Second have had the impudence to forge an *Act of Parliament* The Case for the destruction of Hereticks, said by of Ephraim them in the title to be made in the Parliament and Judah, at Westminster quinto. Regis. This Imposture<sup>P. 21, 22,</sup> was indeed detected in the next Sessions of<sup>23.</sup>

Parliament, and this Act of theirs declar'd to be null and void: so their Design came to nothing. But I think this sufficiently shows their Disposition, and what uses they are ready to make of our Simplicity.

(2.) But it will be still more easy to conceive how this Clause was impos'd on us, if the *Articles* were only printed in Latin in the year 1563. with the Clause in them, and in that very year in *English* without the Clause, as I am apt to imagine they were. For tho Dr. Heylin says, *they were printed both in Latin and English, with the Clause of the Churches Power in them, in 1563.* yet I find it affirm'd by a Gentleman in the year 1660.

Some Necess. of Reform. by W. Hamilton, Gent. p. 14.

*That there was a Diversity of printed Copys as to the Clause of the Church's Power, in the very Year they were first agreed on. And again, at the bottom of the same Page, That in that very Year there were two printed Editions of the Articles, one in English, and another in Latin, whereof the one had the Clause, and the other wanted it. And to confirm this account, I shall present the Reader with a Passage out of a Letter from a Friend of mine at Oxford, whom I desir'd to send me a Collation of the first English Edition of the Articles, mention'd in the Oxford Catalogue. He writes me word, That he has done his Endeavour to satisfy me, but not with that good Success he hop'd for: since for the first Edition of them in English in the Year 1563. he found there had been one; but when he came to look over the Book in which it had been bound up among other Miscellanys, he found it entirely cut out, as appears by the space that*



*that is there left.* So that if it be consider'd that the Articles were only printed in Latin in 1563. with the Clause in them, but that it was left out in the English Edition of that Year, my Lord of *Sarum* may very easily imagine how such an Imposition might begin in those times.

(3.) I have a further reason besides Mr. *Hamilton's* Testimony, and the cutting out the Articles of 1563. at *Oxford*, for supposing the English Edition of that Year wanted the *Clause*. I have an old Edition of the Articles in English, printed by *R. Jugg*, and *J. Cawood*, Printers to the Queen, without any date, where the Clause is wanting. And upon examination I think I have reason to believe this to be the English Edition of 1563. because I find it answers all the Characters that Bishop *Pearson* gives us of the Bib. Scrip. first Edition of the Articles in English. He Eccl. Ang. says, the first Edition was set forth by *R. Jugg* P. 357. and *J. Cawood*, and that the Articles had no P. 361. number affix'd to them: both which exactly agree to my Edition, and the last particular distinguishes it from all the Editions I have seen; for in the Editions of 1571. and all since, I find the Articles are numbred.

Besides, this old Edition of mine recites only the Titles of twenty Homilys, agreeable to an Edition of the Homilys printed in 1563. which contains only twenty; whereas the later Editions of the Articles give us the Titles of one and twenty Homilys, agreeable to the later Editions of the Homilys.

Wherefore I think I may with some confidence assert, That in the very first Year wherein the Articles were printed, there were two different Copys going at the same time, one in Latin with *the Clause*, and the other in English without the Clause: and consequently the difficulty of conceiving how the Imposition of the Clause might begin, is very easily solv'd.

(4.) But for a full and effectual Confutation of my Lord of *Sarum's* Supposition in favour of some (whom one wou'd think he shou'd know better) *That no Fraud is to be suspected while a thing is fresh and well known*; I will lay before him two Instances, which his Lordship will allow to be just, whereby it may appear how very practicable it is for some Men to impose on others, *while things are fresh and well known*.

In the Year 1552. and the 6th of King Edward the VIth, there was a Convocation held in London: and during the sitting of the Convocation there came out in print a *Catechism* and *Articles of Religion*, both bearing the Name of that Synod. And it is a matter of Fact deliver'd down to this time, that they both had the Authority of the Convocation. Dr. Atterbury says, *That in the 6th Year of King Edward the VIth (1552.) the Convocation then met, and past 42 Articles.*

\* Bibl. Bishop \* Pearson and Mr. † Strype both say the same thing. And Bishop Sparrow, in his *Collection of our Articles and Canons*, gives them the Title of *Articles agreed upon in the Convocation of 1552.*

As for the *Catechism*, Dr. Atterbury says, *Rights, It had the very same Convocational Authority which the Articles had, and that it was generally understood so in those times when it came abroad; and Cranmer says, It bore the Name of a Synod.* &c. p. 201, 202. Fox, Vol. 3. p. 50.

And yet nothing is more plain, than that neither the *Catechism* nor the *Articles* ever pass'd the Synod, but were both Impositions of some of the Clergy and others of those times upon the Synod.

For, 1<sup>st</sup>. As to the *Catechism*. There was a Disputation between *Philpot* the Martyr, and *Weston* a Papist, in the Convocation-House in 1553. in the beginning of *Queen Mary's* Reign; where *Weston* objected to *Philpot*, That he had set forth a *Catechism*, Ib. p. 16. bearing the name of this honourable Synod, without your Consents. *Philpot* reply'd, That this House had granted Authority to make Ecclesiastical Laws, unto certain Persons to be appointed by the King's Majesty; and whatsoever Ecclesiastical Laws they, or the most part of them, did set forth, they might be well said to be done in the Synod of London; and in this Point he thought the setter-forth nothing to have slander'd this House, as they went about to persuade the World, since they had committed the Synodical Authority to them.

There was a Dispute likewise between the same *Weston* and *Cranmer* in Oxford 1554. wherein *Weston* objected to *Cranmer*, That he had set forth a *Catechism* in the name of the Synod, and yet there be fifty who witness that they were of the number of the Convocation, and yet they never heard one word of the *Catechism*. Ib. p. 50.

And



And Cranmer answers, *I was ignorant of the setting to of that Title, and as soon as I had knowledg of it, I did not like it; therefore when I complain'd thereof to the Council, it was answer'd by them, That the Book was so entitled, because it was set forth in the time of Convocation.*

These Answers of *Philpot* and *Cranmer* clearly show the Imposition on the Synod; and I cannot help adding, out of respect to that excellent Martyr *Cranmer*, that *Cranmer's* Answer clearly shows his own Honesty and Integrity in this whole Affair.

2ly. As to the *Articles* of 1552. being impos'd on the Synod, that will likewise appear evidently out of *Fox*. One of the Popish Charges against *Cranmer* in 1553. in the beginning of *Queen Mary's* Reign, was, *That he did compile and cause to be set abroad divers Books.* *Cranmer* answer'd, *That as for the Catechism and Book of Articles, he granted them to be his Doings; which words, according to my Lord of Sarum himself, decide the Point, so that it will admit of no more Debate, viz. that neither the Catechism nor the Articles were compil'd by the Convocation, tho both of them were put out in their name, and while they sat.*

Ib. p. 551.

Reflect. on Atterbury's Rights p. 28.

My Lord of *Sarum*, to clear further the Authority of the Edition of the *Articles* in 1563. against the Original Manuscript subscrib'd by both Houses of Convocation, says, *The true account of the Difficulty is this, When the Articles were first settled, they were subscrib'd by both Houses on Paper; but that being done, they were afterwards ingross'd in Parchment,*

Expos. p. 16.

Parchment, and made up in form, to remain as Records. Now in all such Bodys, many Alterations are often made after a Minute or first Draught is agreed on, before the Matter is brought to full perfection; so this Alteration was made between the time that they were first subscrib'd, and the last voting of them. But, says my Lord Bishop, the Original Records, which, if extant, wou'd have clear'd the whole matter, having been burnt in the Fire of London, it is not possible to appeal to them.

To which I answer, 1. That let the Articles be ingross'd in Parchment, after they were subscrib'd by both Houses on Paper, still those subscrib'd are the authentick Originals: and were those Parchments (which the Bishop supposes) in being, they wou'd not be of equal Authority with the Originals in Paper, sign'd by both Houses of Convocation.

2. His Lordship's Supposition, That the Alteration was made between the time the Articles were first subscrib'd, and the last voting of them, is inconsistent with the Proceedings of all other Assemblys of Men, who always vote first and subscribe last: And this Method which his Lordship supposes the Convocation took, will never be allow'd to be the Method of Convocation, even by Men who have no great Opinion of the reasonable Proceedings of such a Body.

3. His Lordship refers the proof of his Supposition to Records that are *lost* (which did they appear wou'd signify nothing) and therefore can never be admitted to take place against such incontestable Evidence as

I have produc'd. And I hope, in regard to the Authority of Human Testimony, whereon the Truth of the Christian Religion in some measure depends, that neither his Lordship, nor the Clergy will urge such Presumptions in favour of themselves and their own Power, against the highest Evidence a matter of Fact is capable of, lest *Infidels* and *Scepticks* with as much reason turn such Objections upon them.

4. But to vindicate beyond contradiction the Authority of the Manuscript Articles of 1562. left to *Corpus Christi* College by Archbishop *Parker*, and to destroy the credit of the Latin Edition of the Articles printed in 1563. and overthrow my Lord of *Sarum*'s Supposition of the Convocation's *first subscribing the Articles* without the Clause, and then *voting* them with the Clause; I shall produce a Passage out of that very Latin Edition of 1563. where the Clause was first printed, with which I am furnish'd by Bishop *Pearson*, who in a Book, intitled, *No*  
*Necessity of Reformation*, says, *We know that*  
*there was an Original of the Articles enroll'd;*  
*we can tell them how many Pages that Original*  
*consisted of, even determinately 19. we can as-*  
*sure them this was deposited with Matthew*  
*Archbishop of Canterbury; we can tell them the*  
*Day when it was done, viz. the Fifth Day of*  
*February: all which appeareth by the Post-*  
*script printed with the Articles in Latin in the*  
*Year 1563. by Renald Wolfe the Queen's Prin-*  
*ter. And he then proceeds to give us the*  
*Postscript, which in English runs thus: These*  
*Articles*

Bib. Scrip.  
 Eccl. Ang.  
 p. 362.



*Articles \* of Christian Faith, containing in all nineteen Pages, in a Manuscript in the Custody of the most Reverend Father in Christ Matthew Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate and Metropolitan of all England, the Archbishops and Bishops of each Province, lawfully assembled in a Holy Provincial Synod, do receive and profess with unanimous Assent, and approve as true and Orthodox by Subscription of their Hands on the Twenty Ninth of January, in the Year of our Lord, according to the Computation of the Church of England, One Thousand Five Hundred Sixty Two : And all the Clergy of the Lower House did unanimously receive and profess the same, as appears by the Subscription of their hands, which they brought and deposited with the same most Reverend Archbishop, on the Fifth of February in the aforesaid Year.*

These words contain such a Description of the Manuscript left by Archbishop Parker

---

\* Hos Articulos Christianæ Fidei, continentes in universum novemdecem paginas in Autographo, quod asservatur apud Reverendissimum in Christo Patrem, Dominum Matthæum Cantuariensem Archiepiscopum, totius Angliæ Primatem & Metropolitanum, Archiepiscopi & Episcopi utriusque Provinciæ regno Angliæ, in sacrâ Provinciali Synodo legitimè congregati, unanimi assensu recipiunt & profitentur, & ut veros atque Orthodoxos, manuum suarum subscriptionibus approbant, vicesimo nono die mensis Januarii, Anno Domini, secundum computationem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, millesimo quingentesimo, sexagesimo secundo : universusque Clerus inferioris domus, eisdem & recepit & professus est, ut ex manuum suarum subscriptionibus patet, quas obtulit & deposuit apud eundem Reverendissimum, quinto die Februarii, Anno prædicto.

to *Corpus Christi* College in *Cambridg*, as demonstrate that to be the only authentick Original of the Articles of 1562.

For, 1<sup>st</sup>. The *Postscript* says, That the *Articles in Manuscript* were kept by *Archbishop Parker*; and it is certain *Parker* gave these *Manuscript Articles* to *Corpus Christi* College.

2<sup>ly</sup>. The *Postscript* says, *The Manuscript contain'd in all nineteen Pages*, so does the *Manuscript of Corpus Christi College*; for at the end of it are these words, *These Articles containing in all nineteen \* Pages, &c.* This Agreement of the *Postscript* with the Original *Manuscript* as to nineteen Pages, is of the more consequence, because this *Manuscript* is a fair Draught of *K. Edward's Articles* (which were forty two in number) accurately writ out for the use and serious consideration of the *Archbishop*; some of which are wholly superseded and struck out by the *Archbishop* with a red-lead Pen, and divers others of them are shortned, dashing that thro which he was minded to have omitted: whereas had it been a *Manuscript* consisting only of thirty nine of those Articles of *K. Edward*, and those contracted too, it is reasonable to imagine the *Manuscript* wou'd have fallen short of nineteen Pages; but since it consists of exactly nineteen Pages, it must be the *Manuscript* refer'd to in the *Postscript*.

3<sup>ly</sup>. The *Postscript* says, *The Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces subscrib'd the Manuscript Articles, kept by Archbishop Par-*

---

\* Hos Articulos Fidei Christianæ continentis in universum novemdecem paginas, &c.

ker, on the 29th of January 1562. and so says the *Manuscript of Corpus Christi College*. Ib. p. 289. From all which nothing is more clear, than that the Latin Edition of the Articles in 1563. upon which so much is built, destroys its own credit, establishes the Authority of the Manuscript of *Corpus Christi College*, and cuts off all pretence for imagining the *Clause of the Church's Power* was voted after the Articles were first subscrib'd; since the printed Edition of 1563. came out after the Convocation had done both subscribing and voting.

2. Besides the Authority of the Latin Copy printed in 1563. it is further pretended, in behalf of the Clause in question, That before the *Fire of London* there were Records of Convocation in being that had the *Clause* in them, and that from thence it was taken and printed in the year 1563.

Dr. Heylin says, That having occasion to consult the Records of Convocation, he found this controverted *Clause of the Church's Power* verbatim. Archbishop Laud, in his Speech in the Star-chamber, at the Censure of Pryn, Bastwick and Burton, is more particular, and says, That he sent to the publick Records in his Office, and here, under his Officer's hand, who is a Publick Notary, is return'd to him the 20th Article, with the affirmative *Clause of the Church's Power* in it. And there is the whole Body of the Articles to be seen; and that these Articles were fully and fairly agreed to and subscrib'd in 1562.

And as to the Articles review'd by the Convocation in 1571. he says, They were



settled as in the year 1562. with the Clause in them for the Church: for looking further into the Records which were in his own hands, he found the Book of 1562. subscrib'd by all the Lower House of Convocation in the year 1571. These Particulars urg'd by Heylin and Laud, seem at first view to give some Authority to the disputed Clause; but as all Objections to the Truth do, when examin'd, tend to its Confirmation, so here these Objections will give me an opportunity of setting this matter in a clearer light than I cou'd have done, had not Archbishop Laud and Heylin thought fit to produce these Authorities.

I begin first with the pretended Record of the Articles subscrib'd in the year 1571. because my Answer here will discover what sort of Evidence Archbishop Laud was, and thereby prepare my Reader for what I shall observe more largely, on occasion of the pretended Records of the Articles of 1562. cited also by Archbishop Laud.

P. 208. Now that Archbishop Laud never saw any Articles that were settled and subscrib'd in 1571. as he says he did in his Speech in the Star-chamber in 1637. will be evident from the following Passage written by him, in his History of his own Troubles and Trial: says he, A Committee of the House of Commons sent Mr. Dobson my Comptroller to me to the Tower, to require me to send them, under my Hand, what Originals I had of the Articles of Religion establish'd in 1571. This was on Wednesday, July 12. (1643.) and I return'd him the same day this Answer in Writing, with my name  
to

to it: " The Original Articles of 1571. I  
 " cou'd never find in my Paper Study at  
 " *Lambeth*, or any where else; and whe-  
 " ther any Copy of them were left there, I  
 " cannot tell." So that here you have  
*Laud* contradicting himself, and destroying  
 his own Testimony in the *Star-chamber*, in the  
 fullest manner that can be. While he was  
 in the height of his Power, and had no  
 fear of being call'd to an account for what  
 he said, this *blessed Martyr* made no scruple  
 to put a Falshood on the World, by say-  
 ing, *That looking into the Records which were in*  
*his own hands, he found the Articles subscrib'd*  
*by all the Lower House of Convocation in 1571.*  
 But when he was in apprehension that he  
 shou'd be oblig'd to produce his Vouchers  
 for what he said, he proceeded with more  
 Caution, and tells the Parliament, *That he*  
*cou'd not find the Original Articles of 1571.*  
*either at Lambeth, or any where else.* I do  
 not think his Admirers will alter their  
 Opinion concerning him (any more than  
 I do mine) on account of this notorious  
 Prevarication: I do not hope to produce  
 that effect on them; nor is it of any mo-  
 ment to the question in debate, either whe-  
 ther they do not believe a word that he  
 says, or else lay an equal stress on both his  
 Testimonys; for let them take which side  
 they please, it is demonstrable that his Tes-  
 timony in the *Star-chamber* must go for no-  
 thing.

2. As to the Record of the *Articles* that  
*Archbishop Laud* says were agreed and sub-  
 scrib'd to in 1562. and for which he pro-  
 duc'd

duc'd the *Hand* of a *Publick Notary* in the Starchamber, I answer,

1<sup>st</sup>. By asking, (1.) On what day this *Record* was agreed to and subscrib'd? for if it was subscrib'd before Archbishop *Parker's* Manuscript was subscrib'd, it can be of no validity to establish the Authority of the controverted Clause, the subsequent Subscription of *Parker's* Manuscript nulling all former Subscription. (2.) I ask by whom this *Record* was subscrib'd? for unless it was subscrib'd by both Houses of Convocation, it is of no validity against a *Record* subscrib'd by both Houses, as Archbishop *Parker's* is. (3.) I ask in what manner this *Record* is subscrib'd? for in my Enquirys I meet with something very strange, and that for ought I know Archbishop *Laud* may call *Subscription*. A Friend at *Oxford* writes me word, That there are two *Latin Copys* of the *Articles* printed in the year 1563. by *Renald Wolfe*, wherein the Clause of the Church's Power is inserted; and, says he, I cannot but observe a notable piece of Fraud as to one of these Copys, to the Vellum Cover of which is pasted a long Scroul of Names, of the suppos'd Subscribers to the *Articles* of 1562. But when I came to compare these Names with those Mr. *Strype* has given us out of *Corpus Christi College Library*, that are subscrib'd to Archbishop *Parker's* Manuscript of 1562. I found them quite different; for tho some of the Names are the same with these, yet it is commonly by other Titles: so that neither the *Prolocutor* nor the *Members* cou'd be the same that subscrib'd the *Articles* of 1562. Unless therefore ArchBp  
Laud,



*Laud*, Dr. *Heylin*, or somebody else, had told us in what manner this Book was subscrib'd; we may very well imagine that there was such a piece of Artifice us'd, as there is at *Oxford*, to give credit to the controverted Clause: especially since so much Prevarication appears in supporting it, and there is the greatest Evidence in the world for rejecting it.

2dly. I answer, That there cou'd be no Records of Convocation in the Archbishop of *Canterbury's* Office left in *Laud's* time, proper to determine the question of the Authority of the controverted Clause. For it has already been shewn, that the original Articles were left with Archbishop *Parker*, and that they were given by him as a Legacy to *Corpus-Christi* College in *Cambridge*, at his death in 1575. where they still remain.

3dly. Had not the Manuscript of 1562. all the marks in the world of being genuine, yet the Authority of Archbishop *Parker* must be allow'd to be greater in this case than Archbishop *Laud's*. I suppose Archbishop *Parker* is generally esteem'd a High Churchman, by what I meet with of him in *Wood Athenæ* (who never gives a good word to any one Oxon. vol. of another Character) That he sat in the I. p. 588. See of *Canterbury* with great honour to the time of his death: And therefore he must be suppos'd at least willing to do justice to the Church, tho he might make some scruple of prevaricating in its behalf, as *Laud* did. But there was a great difference between them in another respect. Archbishop *Parker*,

ker, as President of the Convocations of 1562, and 1571. the only Convocations that ever had the affair of our Articles before them, must be acquainted perfectly with their Proceedings, and consequently be better qualify'd to give an account of our Articles than any succeeding Archbishop.

Pag. 70.  
Ann.Dom.  
1617.

4thly. That there were no Records in the Archbishop of *Canterbury's* Office, proper to determine the question before us, in *Laud's* time, will appear likewise from a Passage out of *Dr. Heylin's Cyprianus Anglicus, or Life of Archbishop Laud*; which on other accounts, as well as that before us, deserves to be cited at large. Says he, *The Archbishop* (that is *Archbishop Abbot, Laud's* immediate Predecessor) *had been off the books since the Affront (as he conceiv'd) was put upon him, in burning his Chaplain Dr. Mocket's Book intituled, Politia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ; which had given no small reputation to the Church of England beyond the seas: for which Severity, tho many just reasons were alledg'd, yet it was generally conceiv'd, that as the Book sav'd the worse for the Author's sake, so the Author did not speed the better for the Archbishop's sake; between whom and the Bishop of Winchester there had been some differences, which the rest of the Court-Bishops were apt enough to make use of to his disadvantage. This Dr. Mocket had publish'd in the Latin Tongue the Liturgy of the Church of England, the publick Catechisms, the Thirty nine Articles, the Book of Ordination of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, and many doctrinal Points extracted out of the Book of Homily's; together with Bishop Jewel's Apology,*  
Mr.

*Mr. Noel's Catechism, and his own Politia, &c.*  
*A Collection which the good Man publish'd in a pious Zeal, for gaining honour to this Church among foreign Nations: But then this Zeal of his was accompany'd with so little Knowledge in the Constitution of this Church, or so much byass'd to Calvin's Platform, that it was thought fit not only to call it in, but to expiate the Errors of it in a publick flame. For first his Extracts out of the Book of Homily's were conceiv'd to be rather fram'd according to his own Judgment, which inclin'd him towards Calvinism, as his Patron did; than squar'd according to the Rules and Dictates of the Church of England. And possible enough it is, that some just offence might be taken at him, for making the Fast-days appointed in the Liturgy of the Church of England to be commanded and observ'd ob Politicas Considerationes, for politick Considerations only. But that which I conceive to have been the true cause why the Book was burnt, was, that in publishing the twentieth Article concerning the Authority of the Church, he totally left out the first Clause, viz. Habet Ecclesia Ritus five Ceremonias statuendi jas, & in Controversiis fidei autoritatem: by means whereof the Article was apparently falsify'd, the Church's Authority disavow'd, and consequently a wide gap open'd to dispute her Power in all her Canons and Determinations of what sort soever.*

From which Passage of Dr. Heylin, I argue, (i.) That if *Mocker's* Book was burnt out of enmity to Archbishop *Abbot* his Patron; and if the Reasons publickly assign'd were what the Doctor suggests; and if the



Doctor conceives aright as to the true cause of burning it ; it is evident that the Clause of the *Church's Power* must be a pure piece of Forgery. For if the Omission of the Clause had been really a defect in *Mocket*, why was not that assign'd as a publick Reason for burning the Book ? That wou'd have been so glorious an opportunity for the *Court-Bishops* to show their enmity to *Abbot*, that their omitting to assign that as a Reason for burning his Book, evidently shows that they cou'd not defend the Authority of the Clause. (2.) *Mocket's* Book shew'd the Judgment of Archbishop *Abbot*, and in all likelihood of many other Divines of that time, and thereby render'd the Authority of the Clause very suspicious ; so that it became the *Court Bishops* not only out of enmity to Archbishop *Abbot*, but out of regard to the Church, to have settled the Authority of this disputed Clause, which the Records of that time must have enabled them to do, had there been any to the purpose. But since no attempt was made at that time towards establishing the Authority of this doubtful Clause ; and since ABp *Abbot* and several other eminent Divines must be suppos'd likewise to think it spurious ; nothing can be plainer than that there were no Records then in being proper to determine the Affair of this controverted Clause, but what made against its Authority. The Records belonging to the Office of the Archbishop of *Canterbury* were as visible then as they were afterwards in *Laud's* time ; but since no one then thought fit to make use of them, when  
so

so just an occasion was given, I conclude that there were then none there in favour of the Clause, and that if Archbishop *Laud's* Manuscript did appear to have been there in Archbishop *Abbot's* time, it wou'd be of no authority.

5thly. But Archbishop *Laud* himself has enabled me to put an end intirely to the Authority of this Manuscript, (for which he produc'd the Hand of a publick Notary) in almost as ample a manner as he did in the case of the original Articles of 1571. For when the House of Commons in 1643. sent to him at the same time about the Original of the Articles of 1562. as they did about those of 1571. he sent this Answer with his Name to it: *The original Articles of 1562. with many hands, I did see and peruse at Lambeth; but whether the Bishops hands were to them or not, I cannot remember.* So that these original Articles of 1562. for which he cites a Publick Notary, are plainly of no authority, when consider'd in opposition to Archbishop *Parker's Manuscript*: For sure no one will say that a Manuscript subscrib'd by one House of Convocation, is of equal authority with one subscrib'd by both Houses, and both Provinces. But,

6thly. It does appear, That there was a double Subscription of the Articles, first by  
\* *some Members of the Lower House*, and afterwards by the *Body of the Lower House*

Hist. of his  
Troubles,  
p. 208.

---

\* Acta Conv. Anno 1562. printed in the Synodus Anglic. p. 206.

on the fifth of February †. From whence I argue, That either the Articles, which were thus doubly subscrib'd, were numerically the same, or somewhat different from one another. If they were numerically the same, then the *Records* for which *Laud* produces the Hand of a *Publick Notary*, must be forg'd Records, with a sham List of Names tack'd to them: because these Records of *Laud* differ from the Articles sign'd by the *Body of the Lower House* on the fifth of February, which were lodg'd with *Archbishop Parker* (as appears from a || *Postscript* to the first *Latin* Edition of the Articles in 1563.) and are now to be seen at *Corpus-Christi* College in *Cambridge* without the Clause. If the Articles thus doubly subscrib'd were not the same in all respects, then those *Records*, for which *Laud* produc'd the Hand of a *Publick Notary* (if they were true Records) must be those first subscrib'd by some Members of the Lower House; because *Archbishop Parker's* Manuscript was left by him to *Corpus-Christi* College at his death in 1575. and consequently was remov'd from the Archbishop of *Canterbury's* Office long before *Laud's* time. Wherefore did those Records now appear with the Clause for the *Church's Power*, they wou'd be so far from establishing its Autho-

---

† Ibid. p. 207. compar'd with the *Postscript* (to the first *Latin* Edition of the Articles in 1563.) printed in *Bibl. Script. Eccl. Ang.* p. 362.

|| *Bibl. Script. Eccl. Ang.* p. 362.



rity, that they wou'd intirely destroy it. For the appearance of such a Record wou'd show that there was a Contest in the Convocation of 1562. about the *Clause* of the *Church's Power*; and the Manuscript of *Corpus-Christi* College wou'd show not only that the *Clause* is no part of our twentieth Article, but that the Convocation of 1562. acquitted themselves like Protestants, in throwing out such a *Clause*, which some at that time of day were so much Papists as to subscribe; whereby the Sense of our Church wou'd be discover'd in a more compleat manner against the Doctrine of the *Authority of the Church in Controversys of Faith*, than if a *Clause* asserting its *Authority* had never been offer'd at.

Thus I have produc'd what I think fit at present to demonstrate both the Forgery and Absurdity of this *Clause*: But yet I hope no one can think me so irrational, as to propose either by the *one* or the *other* to produce any other effect on our *High-Church Priests*, than a greater Noise and Zeal than ever in its behalf; for as my Lord of *Sarum* Exp. p. 5. very justly observes, *When Corruptions are beneficial to the whole Body of the Clergy, they can never be reform'd without a miracle by the major part.* And therefore I shall conclude this matter with a few Inferences from the whole, for the sake of those to whom it is written; who either have no interest to mislead them, or else have a Love of Truth superior to such a consideration.

As,

Mark 7.  
13.

As, 1<sup>st</sup>. A Man may see by this Instance how uncertain *Tradition* is, and by what sort of means *that* has, not with the *Jews* only, but with the majority of *Christians*, gone a great way towards *making the Word of God of none effect*.

2<sup>ly</sup>. How uncertain the Evidence of the gravest Divines in Church-Matters is, more especially since they give ground to make one believe, that they think themselves oblig'd in Conscience to promote the *good of the Church* by Fraud (as well as Force) as the Instances I have given wou'd tempt one to imagine. For I can hardly conceive so ill an Opinion of ABp *Laud* or Bp *Pearson*, as to believe them capable of offering things to the World against their own knowledg, upon any other Principle, but that out of Conscience they think themselves oblig'd to use that *Trick* (as ABp *Tillotson* phrases it) of the *Zealots, of Lying for the Truth*.

Sermons,  
Vol. 4.  
P. 433.

3<sup>ly</sup>. If Men may be impos'd on so easily in such a Country as ours, how much more easily may they be impos'd on in the more ignorant and dark Corners of the Earth, especially before Printing was invented, when all kind of Literature was wholly in the hands of Ecclesiasticks?

4<sup>ly</sup>. If Priests are capable of venturing to forge an Article of Religion, and Mankind are so stupid as to let them have Success, how can we receive Books of Bulk (such as the *Fathers* and *Councils*) that have gone thro their hands, and lay any stress or dependence on their Authority? Ought we not rather

rather to suppose, that where they have had an Opportunity, they have laid out their natural Talents in Alterations, Interpolations and Rasures of those Books, than that they have let us have any thing pure and unmixt as from the Fountain, where it has been in the least degree in their Power ?

5ly. We may learn how advantageous such Discoverys are to *True Religion*, which can never be rendred suspicious, or of doubtful Authority, but when it is mix'd and blended, and put on the same foot of Credit with the Forgerys of Priests. Let Religion (which signifys Man's Duty to God) stand on those Reasons which must of course occur to every body, without the assistance of Forgery from the Priests, and Persecution from Magistrates at their instigation ; and it cannot be suppos'd, but that all *well-meaning* Men must come into it, without a high Reflection on Almighty God, in making him to require that as a Duty of us, which with the best Intentions we are not able to arrive at the knowledg of.

6ly. and Lastly, How great a value we Protestants ought to set upon the Holy Scriptures, those inestimable Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledg, since there is nothing but uncertainty to be met with every where else ; and since we are assur'd by the Spirit of Truth it self, that *they* alone are able to make us wise unto Salvation. They 2 Tim. 3. have a universal Tradition to support them, 15. infinitely beyond the Evidence of any other



ther matter of fact, and have besides the  
 I Cor. 2. 4. *demonstration of the Spirit and of Power.*

But I cannot express my sense better against the Authority of Priests, and for the Authority of the Protestant Religion contain'd in the Scriptures, than in the words of our incomparable *Chillingworth*:

*Prot. Rel.* says he, " By the Religion of Protestants I  
*a safe way,* " do not understand the Doctrine of *Lucap. 6.*  
*Sect. 56.* " *ther, or Calvin, or Melancthon*; nor the

" Confession of *Augusta or Geneva*, nor the  
 " Catechism of *Heidelberg*; nor the *Arti-*  
 " *cles of the Church of England*; but the  
 " Bible, the Bible, I say, the *Bible only* is  
 " the Religion of Protestants. Whatsoever  
 " else they may believe as matter of  
 " Faith and Religion, they cannot do it  
 " with coherence to their own grounds, nor  
 " require the Belief of it of others, without  
 " most high and most schismatical Presumption. I for my part, after a long,  
 " and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial  
 " search of the true way to Eternal  
 " Happiness, do profess plainly, that I cannot  
 " find any rest for the Sole of my Feet,  
 " but upon this Rock only. I see plainly  
 " and with my own Eyes, Councils against  
 " Councils, some Fathers against others,  
 " the same Fathers against themselves, a  
 " Consent of Fathers of one Age against a  
 " Consent of Fathers of another Age, and  
 " the Church of one Age against the Church  
 " of another Age. Traditive Interpretations  
 " of Scripture are pretended, but  
 " few or none to be found: No Tradition  
 " but only of Scripture, can derive it self  
 " from

" from the Fountain. In a word, there is  
 " no sufficient certainty, but of Scripture  
 " only, for any considering Man to build  
 " upon. This therefore, and this only, I  
 " have reason to believe: this I will profess,  
 " according to this I will live; and for this,  
 " if there be occasion, I will not only wil-  
 " lingly, but gladly lose my Life, tho I  
 " shou'd be sorry that Christians shou'd  
 " take it from me."

## F I N I S.

---

Whoever desire Satisfaction as to any of  
 the Citations refer'd to in the foregoing  
 Tract, may repair to Mr. *John Darby* Prin-  
 ter in *Bartholomew-Close*, where the Books  
 from whence they are taken shall be left at  
 their Request.

**ADVERTISEMENT to all True  
Lovers of the Old English Constitution.**

**W**Hereas the Writings of Mr. *Samuel Johnson*, sometime Chaplain to the Right Honourable *William Lord Russel*, have been always peculiarly esteem'd, among the best Judges, for Strength of Argument and a thorow Learning in the Laws and Constitution of *England*, and for having remarkably defended the Libertys of this Nation when in the utmost danger; it is now, at the repeated Desire of several Persons of the highest Rank, as well as many others, propos'd to collect them into one Volume, and to prefix some account of his Life: both as a Satisfaction to those who know the Value of his Writings, and as a Justice to the Memory of so great an *English* Man; who by his bold Pen and Sufferings was known to have been a considerable Instrument of that happy Revolution, which restor'd our Constitution both in Church and State.

The PROPOSALS are,

- I. The said Works shall be correctly printed in Folio, on the same Paper and Character with the Proposals, to contain about One hundred and thirty Sheets.
- II. The Price to Subscribers is Twelve Shillings in Quires; half to be paid down, and the other half on Delivery of the Books.
- III. He who subscribes for Six Books, shall have a Seventh *gratis*.
- IV. There will be a small Number printed on a larger and very fine Paper, which will be eighteen Shillings in Quires, and no Allowance.

The said Work being now in the Press, and but a small number printed, 'tis desir'd that all who are willing to incourage it be speedy in their Subscriptions; it being design'd to be publish'd by *March* next at furthest, and to prefix the Names of all the Subscribers.

The Undertakers are, *Andrew Bell* at the Cross-Keys and Bible in *Cornhill*, *John Darby* in *Bartholomew-Close*, and *Egbert Sanger* at the Post-House in *Fleet-street*: of whom Proposals may be had.